

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: February 20, 2001
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
February 7, 2001 (Meeting #16)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Jack Burkman | City of Vancouver Council Member |
| Jay Cervený | City of La Center Council Member (P) |
| Dean Dossett | City of Camas Mayor (P) |
| Bill Ganley | City of Battle Ground Mayor |
| Michael Hefflin | City of Ridgefield |
| Mary Kufeldt-Antle | City of Camas Council Member (A) |
| Betty Sue Morris | Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair) |
| Jim Robertson | Town of Yacolt Mayor (P) |
| Judie Stanton | Clark County Board of Commissioners |
| | (P) Primary (A) Alternate |

Public:

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Marnie Allen | Clark County Schools |
| Kathy Folkers | Howsley Law Office |
| Ken Hadley | Self |
| Alison Mielke | Friends of Clark County |
| Lynda David | RTC |
| George Vartanian | Self |
| David Ward | Landerholm Law Firm |

Staff:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Monty Anderson | City of Washougal Planning Director |
| Bill Barron | Clark County Administrator |
| Rich Carson | Clark County Director of Community Development |
| Derek Chisholm | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Tamara DeRidder | City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Eric Eisemann | Cities of La Center & Ridgefield |
| Gordy Euler | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Lianne Forney | Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director |
| Bob Higbie | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Eric Holmes | City of Battle Ground Planning Director |
| Patrick Lee | Clark County Long Range Planning Manager |
| Rich Lowry | Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney |
| Oliver Orjiako | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Bob Pool | Clark County GIS & Assessment |
| Marty Snell | City of Camas Planning Manager |
| Bryan Snodgrass | City of Vancouver Planner |
| Josh Warner | Clark County Community Development |
| Phil Wuest | Clark County Long Range Planning |

1. Roll call / Introductions

Morris calls the meeting to order at 4:10. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

2. Review January 24, 2001 Steering Committee Notes

The committee reviewed the notes that were handed out at the meeting. No changes to the minutes noted.

3. Review of Vacant and Buildable lands maps.

Lee explains a part of the maps. There are three maps of each urban growth area. The maps show gross vacant and buildable lands minus the critical lands for residential, commercial and industrial lands. This information is in the buildable lands handout. The connection to the update process is to look at what capacity there is still available in the UGAs. The gross acres are converted into net acres. This is used to determine capacity within the UGAs. Then population projections, type of housing and jobs creation numbers are calculated in as demand factors. This is basically how the UGAs are sized.

Twenty-five percent demand factor is added onto the calculations to, in effect, look at a 25 year growth period. Staff is recommending that the additional market factor not be used in the analysis. CRDC asked to take all tax-exempt properties off of the available lands. Staff disagrees with this suggestion. Phase III of the process will be allocation.

Dosset asks about the market factor. Lee responds that pre-GMA it was seen as being needed and is not viewed that way today. Today there is sufficient capacity. Lowry adds that the Hearings Board in the first remand concluded that when the market factor is combined with a max size UGA concluded that there needed to be some short-term permanence to the UGBs. Carson says that the 20 years is already a market factor. Adding anything else is an addition. Burkman mentions that five-year intervals allow

corrections to take place. Morris says that staff recommendations maintain the 75 % rule and take out the 25% market factor. Lowry says that the market factor was only one part of the calculation and should not be look at alone. Kufeldt-Antle asks if staff is saying the communities have the land they need. Lee says not necessarily, but that is possible. It depends on many demand-side factors (i.e. the demand assumptions). Morris reiterates the establishment of the demand-side factors such as density requirements. If you want to move the boundaries of UGAs you can set up the scenario that way. Burkman says that the assumptions have changed since 1994. Morris says there are greater deductions because of critical lands. The gross numbers we have are in the joint PC/Commission hearing packet for tomorrow. Morris predicts there will be challenges to the calculations. The numbers in different packets do not seem to be the same. The policy paper numbers are not the most up to date numbers. The staff report to the Planning Commission for February 8 public hearing has the updated numbers. Lee goes over the land consumption numbers. These numbers do not include tax-exempt properties such as port industrial lands. Orjiako adds that there is a policy question of what will be changed to higher designations.

Morris asks Orjiako to detail some of the maps. First he shows the existing zoning and the UGBs. Vancouver is used to demonstrate. The model was run on zoning and they will go back and run it on the comprehensive plan designation. The details of the model calculations are in the buildable lands model handout. Morris asks if there is a breakdown by percentages between vacant and underutilized. Orjiako says the numbers are only in acreage now, but the percentages can be done. Morris points out that it is key to know the difference between underutilized and vacant. Orjiako says that the change in definitions did have an impact. Then Orjiako goes over the industrial map. Burkman points out the Port "tax exempt" lands should be included in the calculations. Commercial lands are also reviewed.

Eisemann asks about the changes in the current numbers and the July numbers. Orjiako would need to review the numbers to answer the question. Changes were made as a result of comments from the July numbers. There can be inconsistencies in the assessment roles and how the properties are designated in the model. Pool comments that the parking lots had previously shown up as vacant. The model has been changed and parking lots are not now in the model. Another change in the commercial model is the residential on commercial will be vacant where they were excluded before. Holmes asks if the maps are a depiction of the numbers in the staff report. Orjiako says yes. The maps are provided so that corrections can be made if necessary. The issue of redevelopment has not been addressed. Burkman says there is a lot of new information and the Board is going to hear this tomorrow. Ganley wants to make sure that the numbers be looked at by the staffs of the local jurisdictions. Morris responds that the testimony is not closed tomorrow night. There is plenty of time for input. The home builders and realtors are also looking at the maps for possible corrections. Morris says that the staffs have done a masterful job of dealing with all of the variables involved in the modeling. We can never reach perfection on the maps. The numbers constantly change. Morris points out a January 17 memo from Lee to address mapping concerns. She recommends that people review that document. At some point we need to decide when we are as accurate as we can be. There is no

closure until after the Planning Commission deliberates. Kufeldt-Antle is concerned about staff not having time to review and then testify tomorrow. Morris responds that the presentations can say that there has not been sufficient time to review the maps. Cervený says that from LaCenter's point-of-view they want time to review because he feels there are problems with the current map. Lee says that the new numbers in the table are as good an estimate as they can be. Dosset asks if the 'flawed' maps should be presented to the public. Orjiako responds that staff is confident that the maps reflect what the criteria in the model asks. If field visits are necessary that can be done. Morris is going to look at the maps as well. She makes the point of looking at consistency. Carson says that the maps should be shown so that the public can respond to the maps. Hadley and RGF looked at properties and felt that the maps are improved, if not totally accurate. It is a tough job.

4. Discussion of Vancouver proposal for enforcement of housing goals.

There is a letter from the small cities that was handed out at the meeting. Dosset speaks to the letter. They reached an agreement that consensus was reached on December 14. They feel the discussion today is not necessary. Morris suggests that the discussion might be fruitless, and when there is division of opinion among the Steering Committee the Board of Commissioners will decide. She removed the issue from the agenda.

5. Policy Issues closure discussion.

Morris asks if there are other issues that need to be discussed. A letter from July 27 has a list of topics. There has been little consensus to date. Are there issues that should be discussed in this forum? Burkman says that the door is closing on discussions. Allocation of population and employment need to be looked at. Ganley concurs.

6. Technical Advisory Committee Update

No discussion.

7. Other

Nothing presented.

8. Next meeting time and date.

Morris asks that other meetings should be held off until after the population projection has been selected. Lee says it should probably be in April. Morris says that you should keep slots open in March and April.

9. Adjourn

The Steering Committee adjourned at 5:30 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - february 7 2001(#16).doc